	Page 2669
1	foregoing matter went off the record at 3:49
2	p.m. and went back on the record at 3:52 p.m.)
. 3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Moss, you're up.
4	again?
5	MR. MOSS: I am, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're pitching a
7	doubleheader today.
8	MR. MOSS: Last one today.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just let me know
10	when you're ready and the witness is ready.
11	MR. MOSS: Sir, are you ready?
12	THE WITNESS: I'm ready.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sir, would you
14	stand and raise your right hand while I
15	administer the oath?
16	WHEREUPON,
17	MARC GOLDSTEIN
18	was called as a witness by Counsel for Comcast
19	Cable Communications, LLC, and, having been
20	first duly sworn, was examined and testified
21	as follows:
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you, sir.

Mediaedge, Maxim, and Mediacom. And we all

fall under the overall corporate umbrella of

21

22

the WPP Group, which is the largest advertising, media, and research company in the world.

At GroupM, I was responsible for the functioning of each of these clients -- or, rather, each of these independent agencies. Each has their own set of clients, and each does work independently of one another for the most part.

Q And prior to your role as CEO of GroupM?

A Prior to that I was the CEO of one of those independent agencies, Mindshare. I was CEO for about six or seven years. During that time, I also did some double duty as being the President of the National Broadcast Group.

The National Broadcast Group at
Mindshare, and at all of the agencies, is
charged with spending our clients' money in
national television, national television being
defined as network television, the ABCs, CBSs,

NBCs of the world, the cable companies, as well as syndicated programming -- those programs that are nationally syndicated like Entertainment Tonight, the Oprah Winfrey Show, Jeopardy, etcetera.

And we purchase all of the 30second commercial announcements, 15, 60s,
whatever the clients want, on behalf of that.
So for about three years I did double duty
running National Broadcast, and then later
exclusively CEO and President, and I gave the
day-to-day leadership of the National
Broadcast Group to my two colleagues who
shared the co-Presidency.

Q And prior to your role in Mindshare, where were you?

A Prior to Mindshare, I was at -- I had helped form and create in 1993 an independent, or, rather, an organization under the Interpublic Group, another major media conglomerate, that was called General Motors Media Works.

General Motors Media Works was a dedicated unit within the IPG family that was focused solely on buying national media for all General Motors brands, whether it was a car division, whether it was GMAC, whether it was DirecTV, which we owned and launched in those days, and we bought all -- as I said, all network television, all cable television, all syndication television, as a dedicated entity working only on General Motors.

Q And can you just briefly run through for us prior to the time at which you were at General Motors, where else you have been in the industry?

A Well, I was -- for the four years prior to General Motors Media Works, I was at Lintas, which is one of the agencies, again, under the IPG Group. I joined Lintas in part to work on the GM business. In those days, Lintas -- GM divided the national broadcast responsibility. We were responsible for cable and for all sports buying, as well as other

companies within the Lintas family -- IBM,
Maybelline, etcetera.

And then, later on we won the consolidated GM business in 1993, which gave us prime time news, late night, etcetera.

Prior to Lintas, I ran the National Broadcast Group at Ogilvy & Mather, and prior to that I spent nine and a half years getting my feet wet, so to speak, in national broadcast at Benton & Bowles Advertising.

Q And you mentioned purchasing advertising, on which sports programs have you purchased advertising for your clients through the years?

I've bought time on the NFL, college football, college basketball, golf, NBA, NHL, Major

League Baseball, tennis grand slams, NASCAR,

Olympics. I think I have covered most of the sports, and there are probably a few other sports like the Tour de France that I bought as well.

Q Any sense as to how much money on behalf of your clients you have committed in advertising through your career?

A Well, it's a lot. It is literally billions. In the time that we were working solely on behalf of General Motors, we were spending in excess of a billion dollars a year. So when you accumulate monies over the 36-year period, it is tens of billions of dollars.

Q Now, Mr. Goldstein, I'd like to briefly run through a few of your opinions in your direct testimony. First, have you reviewed the opinion put forth by Tennis Channel's expert, Dr. Singer, his conclusion that advertisers view sports networks as a class?

A Yes, I have.

Q And have you reached a conclusion about that opinion?

A Yes. In fact, I think it's overly simplistic and doesn't give any credence to

the complexity or the way we actually look at this subject. We look at sports on a seasonal basis. We look at sports from the audience that it delivers. We look at it from the age of that audience. We look at it from a male versus female skew basis. We look at the average audience, because different sports deliver different average median age of their viewership.

We look at what the brand or the client is looking for. It's no good if I really want to be in the NBA finals in June if I'm a colds/flu brand, for example, advertising in November/December. So you have to marry all of the different factors that we are looking at for the sport itself with the goals and objectives of what the brand or the client is trying to achieve, and then make a decision on which one fits best or how many fit best.

Q But isn't it true, sir, that advertisers have sports budgets, and that

sports networks are all competing for the same budget.

2.0

A Not necessarily, not at all.

Advertisers look at these things on multiple levels. There is no absolute one way.

Advertisers look at sports as a proxy to deliver men. We want to deliver men. In so doing, we have some clients who look at, how do I best deliver men?

Sports is going to be one of the possibilities, along with cable channels that tend to overdeliver men or deliver more men than other cable channels, something like the Discovery Network, something like National Geographic, something — History Channel. All are cable networks that deliver more men, so some advertisers will look at men. Some advertisers will in fact have a sports line.

When I was at General Motors, we didn't have a sports line. We had a specific sports budget. So we had a budget specifically for the NFL, a budget

specifically for college football, a budget specifically for the NBA, and on and on. They were sport-specific. There was no, if you will, general sports budget.

Q Mr. Goldstein, you have also opined on how advertisers view tennis and golf.

A I looked at that, and I looked at it primarily from two points of view. I looked at popularity, if you will, and I looked at popularity from a viewer point of view and from an advertiser point of view.

Q I guess my first question is: how do advertisers view tennis and golf?

A Well --

Q Do they view them as similar?

A —— generally speaking, we look at tennis and golf as very different. From a viewership point of view, tennis is a —— delivers more viewers. It's a higher rated sport on an overall basis. It is a network televised sport for roughly 30-some-odd weeks

of the year, every Saturday and Sunday, on

CBS, NBC, and sometimes ABC, from mid-January

until the end of September at the FedEx

tournaments.

Q Mr. Goldstein, I think you said tennis and I --

A I'm sorry. I meant golf. I apologize.

(Laughter.)

Slip of the tongue. Golf is on network television every single weekend,
Saturday and Sunday, roughly middle of January through the end of September or early October, and from a viewership point of view is a very highly rated sport.

I mean, if you look at the most recent golf major, the Masters, it delivered a 9-1/2 rating. It was down a little bit from the 10-plus of a year ago, but it will probably be one of the highest-rated sports that we have in 2011, just as it was in 2010.

And I took a look at the golf

performance this year. I looked at -frankly, I looked at many of them. I looked
at the Phoenix Open. It was a sport that does
not have a title sponsor. As you know, most
-- many golf events have advertisers as title
sponsors -- the Honda Classic, for example.
Well, this one didn't. It didn't even have
Tiger Woods in it.

And it aired on Sunday, February

7th, against Superbowl pre-game coverage. It
aired, if you will, right in, and it did a 1.8

rating. Now, that's a modest rating, even in
golf standards, but it's about 15 percent

higher than the finals of Wimbledon, which
aired in July on NBC.

So when you look at it from a viewer point of view, you see that golf generally is delivering higher ratings than tennis on a pretty consistent basis.

I looked at one other thing. I looked at it from an advertiser point of view, and I checked out how many advertisers want to

be associated with golf. There are 42 corporate partners that are listed as PGA tour sponsors. That's a pretty significant number, and it covers a wide range of products and services.

I then looked at how many were corporate sponsors and partners of the Association of Tennis Professionals, the organization that runs the ATP tour that runs here in the United States. There were only eight.

And I kind of thought to myself, well, I've got 42 corporate partners on one hand, eight on the other. That's got to speak to the way advertisers view a willingness, a desire, and an interest in being part of a particular sport.

Q Mr. Goldstein, did you look at how advertisers would view the gender composition of the viewership of the respective sports?

A Yes, I did. As I mentioned earlier, we tend to look at sports as a proxy

for delivering men. Now, there's lots of different ways to deliver men, and, frankly, you might say, "Well, why do you have any interest in delivering men apart from women?"

And when you look at the television landscape, if you will, we kind of segment everything by day parts. So we have — if you start the day at 7:00 in the morning, and 7:00 to 9:00 we call early morning, and it's the Today Show and Good Morning America. 10:00 usually until about 4:00 in the afternoon is dominated by soap operas, and there are some talk shows these days.

Early evening news tends to be a day part unto itself. 6:30 to 7:00 it's Brian Williams, Diane Sawyer. Prime time, 8:00 to 11:00, is pretty much a hodgepodge of lots of different programs on ABC, CBS, Fox, the CW. And then, late night television at 11:30, where we've got Letterman and Leno, Nightline certainly for half an hour, and some programs

that air after Leno and Letterman.

2.0

But the commonality among those day parts is that they all tend to deliver more women than men. Roughly 55 to 60 percent of the audience in those day parts is going to deliver -- are going to be women, and the reciprocal of about 45 percent are going to be men.

So what we try to do, many of our clients and many of our brands, try to balance that a little bit by finding ways to deliver more men in their audience. So you look to -- as I mentioned, you look to the History Channel, you look to National Geographic, and you look to sports, programs that will deliver significant skews towards men to help balance out that overall male-female ratio and get more males in front of your commercials.

Q Well, sir, The Tennis Channel's viewership has I think approximately percent male. Would Tennis Channel be viewed in the group of networks that would help

1 | advertisers deliver male audiences?

A Not really, not really. And the reason for that is we are looking at networks and programs that skew much greater. And there are lots of sports, for example, and even cable networks, that are 70, 75 percent, and 80 percent men.

Now, why is that important? The dilemma that we face is we are spending so much money in network television, okay, that if we are spending \$10 here, we are spending a buck and a half against men. So it's not -
JUDGE SIPPEL: Sort of like the

THE WITNESS: The advertiser, yes.

Okay? And I don't mean literally \$10. I'm

17 trying to just use --

advertiser.

JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I like that --

19 THE WITNESS: -- that as an

20 example.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

JUDGE SIPPEL: I like the

22 analogies.

an equal amount of money against the two groups. So the dollar and a half that is allocated towards reaching more men has to work real hard to help balance out that audience skew, because we are spending so much money against this other part of the pie, so to speak, in prime time, etcetera, and overdelivering women.

BY MR. MOSS:

Q And how do you make that left hand work real hard?

A Well, you look at those networks, those -- whatever they may be, those opportunities that are going to really deliver heavy numbers of sports -- of male viewers, excuse me, things that are not as balanced, frankly, because I've already got that. I've got that with everything else, so to speak.

I need to overdeliver the male side of the equation with things like Golf Channel or some other sports channels, and,

not to be repetitive, things like History, Nat Geo, you know, and the like.

Q Mr. Goldstein, did you also review Dr. Singer's conclusion regarding the amount of advertising overlap between Tennis Channel and Golf Channel?

A Yes, I did.

Q And did you agree with his conclusions?

A No, I didn't agree. I didn't agree for a lot of reasons. In my experience, when we're buying cable television, first of all, we're buying 20 to 30 networks deep. We don't buy one, two, or three, or we're doing that on a very rare occasion.

We're buying a broad swath of cable networks for our clients. So I would expect there to be a certain amount of overlap, and I found, based on some of his numbers — first of all, he took a very small, and I don't think representative, sample of clients to draw certain comparisons.

He didn't use, literally, the top advertisers, because he chose to not include a group that buy on Golf Channel -- the golf manufacturers and golf equipment makers. I don't think that's a realistic approach to an apples to apples comparison.

He also included prospects which,

I mean, I think every client is probably a

prospect. I mean, if you're in the market,

and as a sales organization, and your goal and

objective is to increase revenue and get more

business, you should be knocking on every

door, you should be making as many

presentations, as many pitches to potential

advertisers as you can. I would think that

you'd be, you know, out there with the top

100, top 200 advertisers as often and as

frequently as you can get a meeting in front

of these people.

So to include prospects, I would think everybody is a prospect. I don't think that's a realistic way of looking at these

on behalf of a network, have you?

A That is correct.

Q And you've never sort of gone out and made the sales calls on -- knocked on the door of prospective advertisers, have you, sir?

A No.

Q And you don't regard yourself an expert in ratings methodology either, do you, sir?

A No, I do not.

Q Now, I'm just going to go back, and you'll pardon me if some of these questions are things we went over a couple of months ago. Generally, would you agree with me that clients give ad agencies and ad buyers a fixed budget to work with?

A Clients give us a budget from which we develop a media plan at the beginning of a year. Usually that coincides with their fiscal year.

Q And you would agree with --

Page 2692 I would say that --1 Α 2 I'm sorry. Q I would say that it rarely --3 4 rarely stays the same as its original number or plan. 5 6 Q But, sir, you would agree with me that for all intents and purposes ad budgets are finite, would you not, sir? 8 9 Α Ultimately, yes. 10 And ad buyers work within these 11 budgets to determine where the resources in 12 the media budget are going to be spent, isn't 13 that right, sir? 14 Α Yes, they do. 15 The norm, I take it, even though 0 16 there can be some changes through the years, 17 the norm, I take it, is that a fixed media 18 budget is given against which you are going to 19 spend, is that right, sir? 20 Α As I said, the budget fluctuates

course of the year. So, I'm sorry, defining

for almost every advertiser throughout the

21

22

it as being absolutely finite is very difficult to agree with.

Q But, sir, didn't it -- you agree that for all intents and purposes ad budgets are finite, do you not, sir?

A Well, at the end of the day, you spend a certain amount of money. I agree with that.

Q Now, I also -- it is also true, sir, that networks compete every single day for every single dollar that they feel that they can get their hands on, don't they, sir?

A I believe so, yes.

Q And, in fact, they go out there and knock on every door, as I think you just said a few minutes ago, don't they?

A I think if they are good at what they do, yes, they do.

Q And there is one big pool of marketing funds that doesn't vary all that much, that fundamentally everybody is picking at, sir, is that correct?